

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 20-23 have been previously withdrawn due to a restriction requirement. Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 and 8-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 7 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 are being canceled, without prejudice. Claims 1, 6, 8, 11 and 17 are being amended. Applicant reserves the right to reinstate cancelled claims in later prosecution.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, clarification was requested regarding the language of claim 1, particularly, “a plurality of information sets” on line 7. Information sets are described in the Specification at least on page 6, paragraph [0018]. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim 11 has been amended as suggested in the Office Action to more distinctly claim the subject matter. The language has been changed from “...wherein said size of said communications is...” to “...wherein said size of said communications buffer is...” Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 17, paragraph [0053] of the specification. Based upon the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 11 are respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D’Amico et al. (U.S. 6,889,339 B1) and further in view of Nam et al. (U.S. 6,138,163). Claim 1 stands objected to, but allowable if rewritten in independent form, as stated in the Office Action. Claim 1, as amended, now incorporates claim 7 and intervening claims 2, 4, and 5. Based on the amendments, claim 1 should be allowable for at least this reason. Claims 3 and 6, which depend upon independent claim 1, should also be allowable for at least the same reasons as on claim 1. Independent claims 8 and 17 have incorporated similar language as that objected to in claim 7, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 9 - 16, which depend from

independent claim 8, and claims 18 and 19, which depend from independent claim 17, should be allowed for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the amended claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action. If the Examiner feels a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants believe that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-3140 of SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL, L.L.P., under Order No. 11000060-0044.

Dated: July 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Dennis L. Vautrot/
Dennis L. Vautrot
Registration No.: 60, 736
SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL
LLP
1717 Main Street, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Phone: 214-259-0900
Fax: 214-259-0910
Attorney for Applicants